

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 98-593-C)

In re the Application of:

Peshkin et al.

Serial No. 09/781,801

Filed: February 12, 2001

Title: MODULES FOR USE IN AN
INTEGRATED INTELLIGENT
ASSIST SYSTEM

Examiner: Jeffery A. Shapiro

Group Art Unit: 3653

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Arlington, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Dear Sir:

In regard to the above-identified patent application:

1. We are transmitting herewith the attached:
 - a. Transmittal Letter in Duplicate; and
 - b. Supplemental Remarks to Response to Office Action Mailed December 26, 2002.
2. GENERAL AUTHORIZATION: Please charge any additional fees or credit over-payments to the Deposit Account No. 13-2490. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.
3. CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this Transmittal Letter and papers, as described in paragraph 1 hereinabove, are being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 703-308-2571) on May 2, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 2, 2003

By: Brian R. Harris

Brian R. Harris
Reg. No. 45,900

FAX RECEIVED
MAY 02 2003
GROUP 3600
FAX RECEIVED
MAY 02 2003
GROUP 3600
OFFICIAL

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 98-593-C)

In re the Application of:

Peshkin et al.

Serial No. 09/781,801

Filed: February 12, 2001

Title: MODULES FOR USE IN AN
INTEGRATED INTELLIGENT
ASSIST SYSTEM

)
)
) Examiner: Jeffery A. Shapiro
)

) Group Art Unit: 3653
)
)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Arlington, VA 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL REMARKS TO RESPONSE TO
OFFICE ACTION MAILED DECEMBER 26, 2002

Dear Sir:

Applicants responded to the Office Action mailed December 26, 2002 by filing a response on March 26, 2003. After conferral with Examiner Shapiro, Applicants further supplement that response as follows:

Remarks

The Examiner has made a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-29 in this application as being unpatentable over Claims 1-31 of copending Application No. 09/781,686. As this is a provisional rejection because neither application as yet proceeded to issue as a patent, this objection would not prevent issuance of the claims in this application. Therefore, Applicants believe that by simply responding

gn
5/15/03
Supp.
Response
#10

to the Examiner's § 103(a) objections in the December 26th Office Action, Applicants made a fully responsive submission.

Nevertheless, Applicants acknowledge the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection made by the Examiner. Applicants further acknowledge that the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection may be overcome by the timely filing of a terminal disclaimer. Should both applications proceed to issuance such that it even becomes necessary to file a terminal disclaimer, Applicants currently intend to file a terminal disclaimer at that time to overcome this rejection.

Applicant further note that in responsive to their filing on March 26, 2003, Applicants received an Advisory Action. As the December 26th Office Action was non-final, the issuance of the Advisory Action was in error. Examiner Shapiro has agreed to correct this error and to respond to Applicants' submission responsive to the December 26th Office Action.

If any questions or issues remain, the Examiner is invited to immediately contact the undersigned attorney, Brian Harris, at his direct dial number (312) 913-3303.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF**

Date: May 2, 2003

By: 

Brian R. Harris
Reg. No. 45,900

*** RX REPORT ***

RECEPTION OK

TX/RX NO	5273	
CONNECTION TEL		3129130002
SUBADDRESS		
CONNECTION ID		
ST. TIME	05/02 14:43	
USAGE T	01'11	
PGS.	3	
RESULT	OK	